2257

Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER
PROUDHON

Vol. XII.—No. 5. NEW YORK, N. Y., JULY 11, 1896. Whole No. 343.

"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!
Shines that high light whereby the world is saved;
And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."
JOHN HAY.

On Picket Duty.

Henry George sees in the free-silver movement, not interest in the money question as such, but simply an expression of industrial discontent. Behind it he sees the land question and the Single Tax. Yes, George, it is behind it, and a long way behind it; and that's what's "worrying" you, if I may borrow the expression of my friend and your disciple, Mr. Bolton Hall.

Ed. Boyce, of Idaho, who was sent to jail by the courts for his participation in the Cœur d'Alene strike, and then to the Idaho senate by his fellow-miners, and who was recently elected president and general organizer of the Western Federation of Miners, has been converted to mutual banking by reading Colonel Greene's work on that subject, and is doing his utmost to make the doctrine familiar to his fellow-workers.

For months after Altgeld liberated Fielden, Schwab, and Neebe the "Sun" dinned in its readers' ears that the Illinois governor had not a friend left in his State outside the Anarchist and criminal classes, and that he would be sent into oblivion at the first opportunity. But nowadays the "Sun" devotes much of its editorial space to rebuking reminders to the Democrats of Illinois that it is much easier to take up a man like Altgeld than to drop him. Talk about "stuffed prophets"! Why, Dana's chock full of sawdust. And he's liable to spill some of it this year, now that he and his brotherhood of thieves are on the run. I tell Dana that he will hear from the Anarchists before this campaign is over.

American newspapers laud the Transvaal president for the clemency exercised by him in dealing with the English prisoners convicted of an attempt to overthrow the government, and refer impressively to the fact that, when a deputation called to thank him, he pointed to a large Bible lying on his table and remarked that that book was his only guide and authority. What transparent humbug, what miserable hypocrisy! Had Oom Paul followed "that book," he would not have imprisoned the rebels at all, and would not have tried them or exacted pecuniary compensation from the South African Company. Nay, more, had he followed that book, he never would have ruled over his people, and the whole question of political privileges would never have arisen. No, Oom Paul does not follow that book any more than the American editors follow it. They who praise Kruger for his Christian mercy violently assail Altgeld for his alleged abuse of the pardoning power, and, if he should point to "that book" as explaining his clemency, they would demand his confinement in a lunatic asylum. When he liberated the "Chicago Anarchists," his howling and shrieking assailants never thought of "that book," and denounced him as an enemy of society and dangerous ally of criminals. Oh, what a sickening lot of humbugs these editors be!

The New York "Evening Post's" somersaults are so numerous in these days of stress and political excitement that it is impossible to preserve a complete record of them. Only the other day it sneered at the American habit of overriding authority and proclaiming opinions about the most abstract matters without the slightest regard to scholarship and scientific culture. In art as well as in political economy the American doctrine, it said, seems to be that no preparation, knowledge, or special fitness is essential, and that one man's opinion is as good as another's; and it called upon us to listen to the voice of scientific authority and put away crude notions. Now, in discussing, for the fiftieth time, "the root of the trouble" in finance, and expressing its very latest and newest view, it says that Mr. Whitney and others are trying to force upon the people a currency system concocted by dry *savants*, and that gold rather than bimetallism would be chosen by the masses under a state of perfect freedom. It says: "The true work of philosophers about currency is not to concoct theories of currency of their own, but to observe the play of the popular mind on currency, and use it to predict what will happen. . . . The whole silver movement is, in fact, an attempt to get governments to override the people's understanding of its own interests, and set up by force an artificial standard of value which the community, left to itself, would reject. It is melancholy to see American statesmen, or politicians either, of all men in the world, advocating such a scheme and citing unknown scientists in its favor. If the nation were left to itself tomorrow, and an end were put to 'legal tender,' and every man left to make his own bargains and contracts, and all this mad confusion, called the 'silver movement," were to cease, in what currency, should we, as rational men, do business? Why, gold, to be sure." So, then, the ignorant victims, who do not know the A B C of finance, are more competent to decide what the currency system shall be than the political economists and trained financial writers! This view, as already said, conflicts with very recent utterances of the "Post" on the question of authority versus popular ignorance. So anxious is Godkin to belittle the significance of economic bimetallism that he forgets that hundreds of thousands of American voters demand free silver, and that not a single platform has been adopted by the victorious party which recommends gold as anything else than a makeshift and temporary expedient. The most radical gold platforms declare for international bimetallism, and advocate gold pending the establishment of that arrangement. However, if Godkin is so sure that gold would be selected as the basis of currency, why doesn't he come out boldly for the abolition of the legal-tender law and all the governmental provisions for gold redemption? Perhaps it is because he knows that next week he will have a different opinion to offer to the public.

Altgeld's nomination for a second term by the Illinois Democrats without a fight of any kind is gratifying to all lovers of fair play. The plutocratic press is, of course, furious and frantic. The length to which it goes in misrepresenting the situation must astonish every sensible man capable of viewing the matter rationally. So silly lying, so stupid accusations, so reckless, wholesale indictments cannot but disgust people with the pillars of law and morality. If the newspapers are to be believed, the overwhelming majority of the Illinois Democracy is against property, order, government, and law. Altgeld is a revolutionary disturber and friend of rioters and violent Communists, and his friends and supporters like him because of this attitude of his. Even a lot of school-girls would know better than to take such ravings seriously. Those who daily assume to represent religion, morality, and honesty have the audacity to reiterate the malicious falsehood that Altgeld believes in freedom to kill railroad conductors, burn cars, destroy property of all kinds, and strangle trade and commerce. This is their way of stating the fact that Altgeld does not admit the right of the president of the United States to send troops to a State for the suppression of violence without the consent of the State authorities. Well, let the heathen rage. Six months ago the plutocratic press pooh-poohed the suggestion that there was any possibility of Altgeld's renomination, and confidently predicted that he would be emphatically repudiated by the party which, they alleged, he betrayed and disgraced; now that he has been nominated by acclamation, in spite of his earnest wishes, they are reduced to the wretched and palpable absurdity of imputing revolutionary sentiments to the entire Illinois Democracy.

Liberty.

Issued Fortnightly at Two Dollars a Year; Single Copies, Eight Cents.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Office of Publication, 24 Gold Street.
Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 1312, New York, N. Y.

Entered at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., JULY 11, 1896.

"*In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the exciseman, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel.*" — PROUDHON.

☞ The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Henry George on the Situation.

A newspaper syndicate sent Henry George to St. Louis to study up the Republican convention and give his impressions to the public. The object, presumably, was to obtain, in addition to the ordinary views of the regular reporters, a radical reformer's view of the present political situation. Certainly there is much to be said from the reform point of view. The new sectional question, the complications over the currency problem, and the threatened disintegration of the old parties,—all combine to make the theme and the opportunity eminently attractive to the philosophical and competent observer. Let us see how Henry George has improved his opportunity, and with what "studies" he has edified the newspaper readers.

It is, perhaps, needless to say that he saw the Single Tax in everything. The leaders were wrong; the delegates were wrong; the people were wrong. Their issues were sham issues, their remedies counterfeit remedies. The land question was the real issue, and the Single Tax was the only panacea. Now, there is nothing unnatural or discreditable in this. The convinced Single Taxer will naturally interpret everything in the light of his own theory, just as any other reformer does and must. The question simply is whether the facts can reasonably be twisted into correspondence with the theory. Is the interpretation plausible enough to appeal with any degree of force to open-minded and reasoning people?

Referring to the division between the east and west on the money question, Mr. George said in one of his letters:

> But is the union really threatened by a new and necessarily sectional division in our politics, which must continue to breed strife until one section overcomes the other? The dangers are grave enough, but they do not seem to me to involve this supreme danger. The slavery question was really a sectional question, for, when it came into political issue, all the slaves were owned in the south, and none at all in the north. But there is in reality no such clear sectional line for division on the money question. The east has not all the gold nor the west all the silver, and, whatever may be the best money, the people of one section are as much interested in getting it and using it as can be the people of the other.

There are silver people in the east as there are gold people in the west, but, having regard to the prevailing, dominant sentiment alone, it is clear that the question presents itself in sectional guise. Why, then, is it that the majority in the west is for silver, and the majority in the east for gold? Mr. George continues:

> The true reason is that the west, as a whole, stands to the east, as a whole, in the position of debtor to creditor. But there is nothing in soil or climate or occupation, or in the character and habits of the people of the two sections of one country, to account for this. It may at first seem that it is due to a constant flow of capital from the elder to the newer sections of the country for investment. But this is not large enough to account for the phenomenon. Of real capital—that is to say, of real wealth (the products of labor)—used in the production of more wealth, the flow from the east to the west cannot be much, and in the aggregate the flow is really from the west to the east.
>
> The real explanation lies in our treatment of land as though it were a product of labor. The land of the west, the natural element to which the labor of the west must be applied to produce wealth, is very largely owned in the east or in Europe, and of the land of the east very little is owned in the west.
>
> Thus the west is increasingly drained of the products of its labor to meet what, economically speaking, is not a return for the use of real capital, but a tribute due to land-owners from those who use their country. The country, as a whole, is tending toward Europe as a whole—is tending toward the relation of Irish tenants to English land-owners. The rich men of the west constantly move toward the east, the rich men of the east constantly move toward Europe, for, by an irresistible law, like seeks like. This is the true explanation of what the people of the west are first to complain of, but which in reality concerns the whole country.

In brief, the theory is this: the land of the west is owned by eastern or European landlords, and the occupying farmers have to pay rent for their use of the soil; against this tribute they rebel, and their talk about silver is the result of the belief that more or cheaper money would reduce the amount of their tribute somewhat. Of course, if they clearly perceived the nature of their trouble, they would demand, not a decrease of tribute, but the abolition of landlordism.

The remarkable thing about this theory is that not one fact or shred of fact can be adduced in its favor. Everything that is known about the silver movement in the United States and Europe is plainly and unquestionably at war with it. In Germany and in England the bimetallic movement is chiefly supported by the large land-owners who exact rent instead of paying it. All complain that agriculture is depressed, and that agricultural prices are unnaturally, ruinously low, and all favor bimetallism as a means of raising prices and aiding agriculture. On the other hand, the Irish people—the tenant and rent-paying people *par excellence*—evince not the faintest interest in bimetallism. Certainly *their* land is treated "as though it were a product of labor," and, if a demand for silver is the first, crude remedy favored by victims of landlordism, the Irish must be credited with greater intelligence and mental power than the American farmers possess. The Irish do not clamor, and never have clamored, for silver; they have been sensible enough to perceive that the enemy is landlordism, and the remedy freedom from rent burdens.

However, the pretence that silver is regarded by the American farmers as a means of fighting landlordism can be disposed of in a simpler way. The statement that the land of the farmers who clamor for silver is "largely owned in the east" is entirely gratuitous. The asserted fact has no existence. These farmers are not tenants, but occupying owners, holders in fee simple. They pay no rent at all. What they do pay is interest, for most farms are certainly mortgaged to capitalists in the east. But what has interest to do with treating land "as though it were a product of labor"? Farms are mortgaged because of the lack of working capital, and the farmers know that, under the existing monopolistic monetary arrangements, they are forced to pay high rates of interest for the capital borrowed by them. They feel that they are injured in two ways,—by having to pay high rates of interest, and by having to sell at unnaturally low prices.

But philosopher and economist George regards the financial question as of no consequence. "We Single Taxers," he says, "would prefer, if we could, to defer any attempt to settle the money question until the real relations of land and labor are better understood." This is the height of folly and fanaticism. Even Single Taxers admit that it will be easier to secure financial reform than a radical change in the system of land tenure, and George really represents none but the fiatists and greenbackers in this position. With reference to the financial question itself Mr. George delivers himself of the following solid wisdom:

> In truth, the sort of money used in any country, considered either as a medium of exchange or as a measure of value, is a matter of relatively small importance. Money has served, and does serve, most important functions in exchange. But there were men before there was money, and the further progress of our civilization is steadily to lessen the use and minimize the importance of money. Money is really a mere medium of exchange,—a mere counter of value,—and its kind or quality is as little essential to the performance of its functions as the kind or quality of a poker chip is to the game. We can exchange between ourselves in any medium that we agree upon. . . . Money, in its domestic use, is merely a local counter for the facilitation of exchange among men. We do not eat money, nor drink money, nor wear, nor, except metaphorically, burn money. Nor yet, save in the metaphorical way, does the possession of money mean wealth, or its absence poverty. . . . The real thing that is exchanged among men, whether between men of the same country or men of different countries, is labor,—either rendered labor, in the form of commodities, or promised labor, in the form of obligations. Thus the only real importance of any change, such as is now coming into issue, is as it would effect the relations of debtor and creditor.

The ignorance, the stupidity, the puerility of these passages cannot be fitly characterized in moderate language. Fortunately it is not necessary to make any comment upon them. No one will read them with greater contempt than those able and stanch Single Taxers, Mr. Stephens and Mr. Stephenson, whose pamphlet on money and banking Mr. George cannot have read with profit. But the amusing thing is that some excellent gentlemen insist upon regarding Henry George as an economist!

V. Y.

Same Old Trick.

The silver movement, which has been pronounced dead hundreds of times, is so powerful and successful just now that the gold-basis people are cudgelling their brains to devise some compromise to placate and quiet their enemies. Instead of the usual showers and torrents of abuse and ridicule; instead of the familiar denunciation of the silver people as cranks, lunatics, repudiationists, traitors, and swindlers,—we are beginning to read conciliatory statements, in which apparently frank admissions are made that there are real grievances, legitimate wants, back of the free-coinage movement, and that, while the silverites are wretchedly wrong as to the remedies proposed, they are profoundly right in their intense opposition to things as they are. Silver, in a word, is not a craze, a delusion originating in stupid discontent with natural law, but a proper and inevitable protest against an essentially vicious system.

Now, this is an old trick. Whenever the silver movement has displayed special signs of strength, the gold fanatics have changed their tactics and plan of campaign. The trick is not altogether a conscious one, doubtless. Many are doubtless really impressed by the success of the movement, and inclined to inquire more critically into matters which they are generally disposed to pooh-pooh and contemptuously ignore. But, whether deliberate or unconscious, the trick has so often been employed that few can be deceived by it at this late day.

A number of financiers and politicians in the Democratic party are advocating the adoption of a plank favoring untaxed State banking as a compromise with the silver men. The south and west, they urge, are right in demanding more money, more banking facilities, freer credit; let us show them that they can obtain these without free coinage, and they will abandon that particular scheme. A repeal of the tax on State banks would afford them the needed relief, and they are fully entitled to that concession.

Of course, it is hardly necessary to say that no real free-banking measure is contemplated. State banks are to be regulated, protected, and rendered "safe" by numerous federal and State restrictions; only the ten per cent. tax is to be taken off. This demand, it will be remembered, was incorporated in the national Democratic platform of 1892 and completely ignored by the Democratic congress elected on that platform. True, in the Cleveland-Carlisle scheme of banking reorganization, the repeal of the tax was one of the central provisions; but, when that scheme was submitted, congress was no longer Democratic, and the cry of wildcatism was at once raised, not only by the Republicans, but by the majority of eastern Democratic organs as well. The silver movement had subsided somewhat, and there no longer appeared to be any necessity to keep the pledge made during the campaign.

Now that gold has triumphed at the Republican national convention, and that silver appears to be supreme in the Democratic ranks, eastern politicians may be expected to bethink themselves that in the State-banking proposition they have a promising antidote to the silver movement, and it would not be at all surprising if the Chicago convention should renew the demand for the repeal of the ten per cent. tax. Such a declaration, however, would be even of less consequence to-day than it was in 1892. There are some radical Democrats who still hope that their party, chastised and improved by defeat, may revert to the principles of freedom and assume a bold libertarian attitude on the currency question. There is unfortunately nothing in the facts or prospects to warrant these fond dreams and anticipations.

Meanwhile, the discussion of possible and safe alternatives to free silver has brought out some interesting admissions from financiers and editors. A few have actually got within gunshot of the truth. Thus Banker Clews, in an eye-opening circular issued recently, expressed himself as follows:

> There is, however, an important class among both planters and farmers to whom credit facilities are even still more vital than "more money." It is well worth considering whether arrangements cannot be devised for satisfying those wants, if not under any now existing banking methods, yet through authorizing other lending institutions specifically adapted to affording the smaller credits which this important class so vitally need.

It is assumed here that it is possible to provide greater credit facilities without broadening the monetary basis. It is also assumed that capital is neglecting good opportunities in the south and west. Neither assumption is correct. Arrangements to satisfy the wants specified would have been made long ago, had capital found there an opening. The cause of the lack of banking and credit facilities lies deeper. Those very restrictions and regulations which no politician or financier ventures to call in question, and which are to be preserved even under untaxed State banking, make adaptation of banking arrangements to the needs of the sections and their special industrial conditions utterly impossible. The New York "Journal of Commerce" does not agree with Banker Clews that things can be improved without any important change in the present financial system. It says, referring to the condition of the farmer who is forced to pay interest at the rate of fifteen to twenty-five per cent.:

> Whatever legislation may not be able to do for such a man, it can at least remove any obstacles which legislation has put in the way of him and his kind, securing all the advantages for borrowing money to which their character and industry entitle them. To preach the advantages of saving to a farmer who has to part with the whole margin of profit on his crop for the use of the money he needs to raise it is like expatiating on the delights of freedom to an inmate of a prison. The one patent fact of his position is that it is one of industrial bondage, and he is incapable of seeing by what act or influence of his he can ever mend it. This much seems clear, however,—that, if he is at any time to save money, he must be relieved of the necessity of paying so much for the use of it, and that this relief must come by the institution of banks specially devoted to supplying his needs. There is a sufficiently profitable and a perfectly safe business in doing this at much lower rates than now prevail, but it will not be done while the national government, by retaining the tax on State bank notes, makes their issue inaccessible.

In another editorial on the same subject, the "Journal of Commerce" approaches the subject still more closely. It writes:

> What this condition of things calls for is a systematized form of credit, which will serve the agriculturist and the small trader in lieu of working capital; a really REPRODUCTIVE FORM OF CREDIT, which will enable the farmer and the planter to buy their seed and to provide the manure, labor, and implements needful to get out of the land all that it is capable of yielding; to recover waste places and to drain or irrigate lands which are now non-productive.

The mere removal of the tax on State banks would not supply this need of credit, although it would be a step in the right direction. Banking must be made really and absolutely free,—free not only from taxation, but also from the condition of redemption on demand.

V. Y.

The Condition of the Laborer.

To the Editor of Liberty:

"Wages are rising," says Mr. Yarros. Well! well! Evidently his much study and great learning have made him mad. Be that as it may, personally, I am sorry to say, I experience no proof of the assertion. On the contrary, the situation is such that I can hardly make both ends meet. And, says he, "the hours of labor are decreasing." Precisely, and to such an extent that, when lodging and meals are provided for, scarcely anything is left for wearing-apparel, resulting in one being compelled through modesty to shun daylight and acquaintances as much as possible.

Of course, suicide would be the thing; but then, the overcoming of the natural repugnance is another and more difficult matter. And thus it is that I have observed that, when I am out of work and with no prospect of getting any, I am prone to throw liberty to the winds, and draw near to, and view with rapture and delight, the then effulgent countenance of State Socialism. To be sure, the thing has a different appearance when the situation is more bright, or at least bearable.

No. 342, just received, gives no consolation, for there you state that "times are bound to become worse and worse." If such be the case,—though I hardly see how they can become much worse,—then it is about time, I think, to learn, or attempt to learn, to pray, —to pray for the appearance of a virulent pestilence about these premises. GEO. PETERSON.

CHICAGO, ILL., JUNE 29, 1896.

When Mr. Yarros said that "wages are rising," he did not mean the remark to apply as specifically as Mr. Peterson seems to think to the year of our Lord 1896. Rather, he was comparing, we will say, the age of steam and of modern invention to the ages that preceded it, and was contending, in opposition to those who claim that the poor are growing poorer, that, in spite of our wretched economic system, a part of the advantages of our greatly-increased and ever-increasing productivity have actually gone to the laborer, rendering his condition, which is, of course, proportional to the purchasing power of his wages, far superior, on an average, to that of the laborer of a century ago. That is to say, the laborer's wages have risen. They are not yet what they should be, for the advantages of modern productivity ought to go to the laborer in their entirety, not simply in part. But that they are already his, to an extent, and a considerable extent, no reasonable man can deny.

This does not alter, and has little or nothing to do with, the very real grievance of which Mr. Peterson complains,—*viz.*, that the laborer, despite his improved status as a rule, still lives in utter insecurity, at the mercy of the ups and downs caused by the old distributive abuses that neutralize in great measure the blessings of our immense productive power. Consequently he is often thrown out of work, and his hours of labor, as Mr. Peterson points out, are all too few. But that is no reason why

Mr. Yarros should be assailed for uttering an indisputable truth. And still less is it a reason for turning hopefully toward State Socialism. If liberty is not a cure for economic ills, then Mr. Peterson should not assume it to be such, even in his prosperous and happy seasons. But, if it is such a cure, then there is no time at which he should be so earnestly in favor of it as in the days of his adversity. T.

Machinery and Rent.

Single Taxers seem to take it for granted that every new labor-saving machine tends to increase economic rent. In No. 341 of Liberty Mr. Horr states this proposition as follows: "As civilization advances; as the sciences, as the arts, and inventions more fully develop, and ability becomes more general,—so will the value of land increase and more or less keep pace with this advance. Under 'occupancy and use' all these advantages would go to land-owners and land-owners only."

Now it seems to me that this is an entirely erroneous assumption.

By a labor-saving machine is meant one that enables mankind to produce a greater amount of wealth, with the same amount of labor, applied to the same amount of land, than could be produced without it. If the demand for the products of labor is the same,—and we must assume this in order to simplify the case,—less labor is required to supply that demand with the machine than without it. If less labor is required, then less land is necessary to which to apply that labor. The result of a new labor-saving machine is "to make two ears of corn grow where one grew before." I think it will tax the powers of even so trained mental acrobats as Single Taxers to prove that a decrease in the demand for land causes an increase of economic rent. The reverse is the opinion of all thinkers upon the subject.

Professor Francis A. Walker shows the effect of cheaper rates of transportation upon rent, in Chapter II., part 4, of his "Political Economy." It is too long to quote here, but I commend it to the careful attention of all Single Taxers.

The invention of a new process of irrigation, a new fertilizer, or a more economical method of treating low-grade ores results in making land that was previously valueless capable of yielding wealth. This is practically adding to the supply of land without any corresponding increase in the demand. The effect must be a decrease of the rent of all land except that which has just been made useful. It should be noted that such improvements do not result in lowering the margin of cultivation. They cause land which before was incapable of producing as much as the poorest land in use to yield more, and so its productiveness is made more than the productiveness of the land at the margin of cultivation. If the demand remains the same, some of the poorest land in use will be abandoned. This will *raise* the margin of cultivation, and, consequently, the economic rent of land will be reduced all along the line.

Single Taxers always point to the increase of rental values in cities, but they forget that this increase is due to other causes than the development of machinery. No one knows better than they that the increase in the value of city property is almost entirely an increase of speculative rent, and is altogether foreign to a discussion of economic rent. They also ignore the fact that the value of farm lands, especially in the older and more thickly-settled districts, is steadily decreasing. I have not been able to obtain statistics of any country save Great Britain. But it is not a little significant to note that, according to Mullhall, the entire rental value of England decreased, from 1880 to 1888, about thirteen per cent., and in Scotland the decrease during the same period was about fourteen per cent. F. D. TANDY.

Ein Wunderlicher Suender.

To my article in the last issue claiming that the Communistic leaders are opposed to liberty John Most replies in "Freiheit" at some length and in characteristic fashion. He begins by saying that I am a *wunderlicher Heiliger* (which means wonderful saint), and declares that he had always taken me for a highly-educated man who, when he writes on a subject, knows what he is talking about, but that in this instance I am fighting a man of straw which I have constructed out of my ignorance, if not something worse. And then he endeavors to establish his opinion.

It will be remembered that I selected, as illustrations in proof of my assertion, Most himself, the Chicago men, Kropotkine, and J. H. Morris. Now, Most takes up the first three *seriatim*, and deals with them as best he can, but totally ignores my citation of Morris's assertion that "holders of private property are invaders." I do not see why he fights shy of this proposition, as it seems to me precisely in harmony with his own view. But let that pass. I will proceed to an examination of his treatment of my assertion regarding himself, and therefrom we shall see which of us it is that knows what he is talking about.

My paragraph read as follows:

> Take John Most, for instance. He says that, after the revolution, if two men coöperate under an agreement that one shall pay the other wages, the arrangement will be terminated by force, even though it be perfectly voluntary.

Of this paragraph Most gives a professed translation into German, and here is his version:

> Nehmet z. B. Most. Derselbe sagt, dass, wenn nach der Revolution zwei Leute die freiwillige Vereinbarung treffen, dass Einer dem Anderen Lohn zahlen solle, die Einhaltung dieser Uebereinkunft durch Gewalt erzwungen werden müsse.

After which translation Most asks where I have heard or read any such nonsense from him, and declares that I have made a fool of myself.

Wait a bit. Suppose we try the experiment of retranslating into English Most's German translation of my original paragraph, and see how much resemblance there is between the two.

> Take, for instance, Most. Most says that, if, after the revolution, two people voluntarily agree that one is to pay wages to the other, the sustaining of this agreement shall be brought about by force.

The translation has been made for me by a German friend of mine, and of its accuracy there can be no doubt. Compare it now with my original paragraph. I had charged Most with holding that after the revolution all contracts to pay wages, even though voluntary, will be *terminated*—that is, put an end to, cancelled, suppressed by—force. Whereupon, in German, he puts in my mouth *precisely the opposite* statement, making it appear that I have charged him with holding that after the revolution voluntary wage-contracts will be *sustained*, upheld, by force.

Of course it would be quite impossible for me, believing as I do in the right to pay and receive wages, to attribute the same belief to Most as a proof that he does not favor liberty. Yet, of two things one:

Either Most's imperfect knowledge of English has led him into a mistranslation from which the smallest knowledge of Individualist Anarchism would have saved him; and in this case he has been engaged for years in discussing, criticising, and abusing a school of thought of which he knows nothing whatever;

Or else, knowing that few of his readers would ever see my original paragraph or my answer, he has deliberately and wilfully put into my mouth a statement exactly the contrary of that which I made; and in this case he is a *wunderlicher Sünder* (wonderful sinner).

I am inclined to think the latter the truer explanation, as Most is probably familiar with and acts upon Goethe's maxim: *Verleumde nur recht frech, etwas bleibt doch hängen.*

Really, however, instead of causing mud to stick to me, his epithets "fool" and "ignoramus" have turned upon himself in most humiliating fashion. Moreover, he has unwittingly corroborated my contention that he proposes to forcibly interfere with people who choose to work for wages, and is, therefore, an authoritarian.

Ist das genug, Herr Most? T.

Who is to Blame?

To the Editor of Liberty:

Can you tell me when the name "philosophic Anarchism" was first applied to the movement represented by Liberty, and by whom? If you cannot give the information exactly, can you give the approximate date, and tell whether the name originated inside the movement or outside? STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

Perhaps some reader can give Mr. Byington the information which he desires. I ought to be able to, but really have forgotten the facts,—perhaps because I have never attached any importance to them. It is my impression that the use of the adjective "philosophic" as descriptive of our movement originated outside. I have never accepted it, and rarely, if ever, have I used it. Every fool thinks himself a philosopher. T.

Anarchism and the Dictionaries.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I think it is time we stopped professing to find the Standard Dictionary's second definition of "Anarchist" a satisfactory one. This definition is: "One who advocates anarchy or absence of formal government as a social and political idea." Now, it isn't the formality of government, particularly, that we object to. Informal government, like that of White Caps, is as bad as formal government, and a little worse. That word "formal," which was probably inserted to make the definition more acceptable to philosophical Anarchists, spoils it all. By quoting this with approval we imply that we have no objection to government, if only it is informal. STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

I quite agree with this, and probably should have said the same thing myself, had I known that the Standard Dictionary's definition is being generally cited with favor by Anarchists. I have seen the much preferable Century definition quoted frequently, but rarely the Standard definition. I can tell Mr. Byington something about this Standard definition. When Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls were preparing their dic-

tionary, they applied to me for a definition of Anarchist. I framed one with great care, and sent it. Unfortunately, I did not keep a copy of it, and do not now remember it. But I know that it was concise, clear, correct, and exclusive, as all definitions should be. Probably it would not have pleased Mr. Byington, for I think it had the word "invasive" in it, and, whenever anybody says "invasive," Mr. Byington throws a fit. Be that as it may, the definition certainly did not please the sapient Funk. He discarded it, substituting the absurdity of which Mr. Byington complains. The word "formal" was not in my definition, which, in fact, was so framed as to make it clear that the distinction between formality and informality is foreign to the subject. If Funk had any intent whatever in inserting the word "formal," it was to irritate the "philosophical Anarchists," not to please them. T.

The editor of the "Engineering Magazine" and the New York "Post" are probably not on speaking terms now. Mr. Godkin has heaped ridicule upon Mr. Dunlap's head, accused him of following the rule of thumb in artistic and financial matters, and held him up to public scorn as an exemplar of American ignorance and self-assurance. Mr. Dunlap, it seems, has been supporting the faction which has d[...]ed to oppose its opinion to the leading American sculptors and artists on the question of the merits of the Sherman statue. The "Post" printed a letter from Mr. Dunlap which it virtually pronounced droll, silly, and empty, and *à propos* of which it moralized about the presumptuous critics whose snap judgments irritate men of culture and training. Now this is base ingratitude. In finance Mr. Dunlap has followed the "Post" too unquestioningly and implicitly, as Liberty has noted with pain and surprise. If, now, Mr. Dunlap's faith in the fairness of Mr. Godkin should be shaken somewhat, the cause of rational finance would be measurably strengthened.

The Democrats of Connecticut deserve credit for their decision to introduce boycotting in politics. When it became known that the silver people had a majority of the delegates to the national Democratic convention, the gold Democrats everywhere began to debate the question "to bolt or not to bolt." Some announced that they would certainly bolt a silver nomination, and others declared that they would bow to the rule of the majority. The Democratic leaders of Connecticut, satisfied with neither alternative, hit upon a novel plan. No, they said; "we will neither bolt or support a silver platform and candidate; we will simply ignore the whole presidential election and all national issues. We will make the fight exclusively on State issues and candidates, and refrain from all mention of national matters throughout the campaign." This is not bolting; it is boycotting. The idea has been favorably received in the press, notwithstanding the stupid denunciation of boycotting so frequently seen in the most intelligent papers. It is not that the gold papers love boycotting now, but they hate silver more, and tacitly agree to overlook the smaller offence. However, familiarity with the boycott will do more than theoretical reasoning to secure for it general toleration and recognition.

Mr. E. H. Fulton, of Columbus Junction, Iowa, whose conversion from Communism to Anarchism was noted in Liberty of June 27, is proving by his works the ardor of his new faith. He has started an Anarchistic paper called the "Age of Thought," which promises very well indeed. It has eight pages, and is well printed. The page is somewhat smaller than that of Liberty, but, as the type is smaller also, the amount of reading matter per issue is about the same as that which Liberty gives. It is published weekly, however, and at the very low price of one dollar a year,—to say nothing of a premium offered in books to the amount of fifty cents. The first two numbers discuss at length and in plumb-line spirit the questions of land and money from the Anarchistic standpoint, and Mr. Fulton announces that, in the third number, he will begin a department similar to that which Liberty instituted under the heading, "The Beauties of Government." On the whole, I am much pleased with the new venture. Mr. Fulton is to be congratulated upon it, and he should receive hearty support from Liberty's constituency. My only fear is that Mr. Fulton is beginning a little too soon. In the very few weeks that have elapsed since he began the study of Anarchism he certainly has acquired a firm and intelligent grasp upon its philosophy. Nevertheless, in his expositions, he falls into some very serious errors, which would not stand criticism for a moment, and which, if accepted, would take every particle of virtue out of the economics of Anarchism. I believe that, if he had taken a little more time for the assimilation of the Anarchistic doctrine, he would have avoided these errors. As it is, he must get rid of them as Pentecost got rid of his,—in public. I ask my readers, one and all, to send a dollar to E. H. Fulton, Columbus Junction, Iowa, for a year's subscription to "The Age of Thought." He is young and ardent, and, situated as he is in the west, where the financial battle is waging, he will be able to lend most efficient aid to Cohen, Tandy, and other comrades in bringing the solution offered by mutual banking before those who are placing a mistaken reliance upon free coinage and other governmental measures.

At a general convention of Michigan dentists a resolution was adopted in favor of a law for the appointment of a public examiner, whose duty it shall be to examine the teeth of children and enforce such hygienic regulations as may be deemed necessary for the preservation of sound teeth. Well, why not? In this era of curfew ordinances, compulsory education, and inspection of all kinds, why not inspection of teeth? And why not inspection of eyes, hair, lungs, ears, and other necessary and useful organs or features of the body? The example of the brave dentists should be followed by other specialists. The right of the social organism to enforce regulations looking to moral and physical welfare of the units being tacitly accepted by all governmentalists, the only thing to consider is whether Anarchy "works well" in private teeth, hair, eye, ear, and lung inspection. If not,—and there will be no difficulty in finding evidence of neglect, ignorance, and mischief in these important relations,—then State action is necessary.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to notify the secretary promptly in case of any failure to write to a target (which it is hoped will not often occur), or in case of temporary or permanent withdrawal from the work of the Corps. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets. Address, Stephen T. Byington, East Hardwick, Vt.

Since its rather hostile remarks quoted in the last number of Liberty, the "Farmers' Voice" has published two more Corps letters,—one from the man whose other letter was given the heading, "Emphatic, if not Courteous," and the other from one who is not a subscriber to the paper. Neither letter, this time, is an avowed attack on the editor.

The long controversy in the Provincetown "Advocate," lately mentioned in this column, is now formally closed. J. T. Small, the man who brought it about, writes thus in comment:

> How much good will come to our cause from this ten-months campaign may never be known. I do know, however, that there has been considerable interest manifested in the discussion during these later days, and I have been told by several people that they were buying the "Advocate" from week to week to read it.

Certainly a large body of readers have been familiarized with the idea that Anarchism was a practical applicant for their favor, with the fact that Anarchists write like respectable people, and with the most important of our fundamental principles. Comrade Small deserves the heartiest thanks of us all.

Target, section A.—The "Advance," 215 Madison Street, Chicago, Ill., a Congregational organ. In its issue of June 18 the following were among the editorial notes:

> Congress has at last adjourned, and the country can give attention to its other evils.
>
> If we may believe the statement of the Chicago board of education, the compulsory education department is "useless, wasteful in money, and a burden to the board." The member had a strong array of figures and facts to establish the truth of his statement. The weak point of the law is that it cannot be enforced by prosecution, and the principle does not seem to be altogether practicable.
>
> Our Wisconsin correspondent's observations on the subject of education, and particularly on the connection between the State university and the high schools, are specially worth consideration. It is a serious injury to the cause of education and to the youth of the State to send them through the university on "short cut" courses, requiring a year or more less work than demanded by the courses of the denominational colleges. It is a cheap bait unworthy a great university.

(The statements of the Wisconsin correspondent were that the University of Wisconsin was in the habit of "accrediting" certain schools, so that their graduates should be allowed to enter the university without examination; that the "accredited" schools regarded this as a valuable certificate of high standing, when in fact, in many cases, it only admitted students to certain special courses in the university, the regular course requiring a higher standard of scholarship; that the inspection on which the accrediting was based was so careless as to often be merely nominal; that the result was a very low educational standard in some of these schools, whose graduates were not nearly ready to pass the entrance examinations at colleges like Ripon and Beloit; and that the motive was to gain students for the State university by getting the favor of the preparatory instructors.)

Show how much reason there is for wanting to be rid of government, how much reason there is for regarding this as practicable, and how unreasonable it is, considering the acknowledged evils of government, to throw Anarchism out of court without an unprejudiced hearing.

Section B.—W. A. Croffut, 104 B Street, N. E., Washington, D. C., formerly an editorial writer on the Washington "Post," a vigorous advocate of liberty from a conservative standpoint. Show how much we yet lack of liberty, how much harm this lack does, and why we should hopefully work for complete liberty. Stephen T. Byington.

Plenty.

Where the reaper greets the morn,
And the fields of wheat and corn
Flourish golden in the sun;
Where the sweeping r[illegible]s run,
Watering the scented [illegible],
On whose grass the cattle feed;
Where the berries, rich in hue,
On the bushes gleam with dew;
Where the fruit-trees, fair and great,
Wave with their delicious weight,
And the full, luxuriant vine
Round the verdant hill doth twine;
Where the finny brood doth swim
In the waters deep and dim,
And the crystals, gems, and ores
Lie in unexhausted stores;
Where the nimble-footed deer
Roam in sport or flee in fear,
And the aged forests rise,
Tall and grand, against the skies;
Where this planet moves in space,—
There is aye my dwelling-place.
I descend within the rain,
Ripening the growing grain;
With the streams I rush and bound,
Moistening the thirsty ground;
With the human mind I grow,
Brightening man's lot below.

Full of gladness is the head
Over which my light I shed;
Clear and sparkling is the eye
That doth ever see me nigh;
Fresh and beautiful till death
Are the cheeks that feel my breath;
And the bosom is at ease
Whose deep anguish I appease.

Sorrow, sadness, care, and fear
In my presence disappear;
Health and hope, content and mirth,
Are engendered with my birth;
Song and dance and revelry,
Love and friendship, follow me;
Thought sublime and fancies bright
Spring, like blossoms, at my sight.

When mankind shall wax more wise
And no more believe in lies;
When the weakling shall be strong
To avenge each galling wrong,
And the slave shall tear in twain
The degrading, loathsome chain;
When the mighty shall be just,
And the hateful sword shall rust;
When the workman and the sage
Shall as equals serve their age;
When the false shall be despised
And the truth of nature prized,—
Then the needy and forlorn
I will gladden with my horn,
And their woes I will efface,
Blessing all the human race.

Basil Dahl.

The Money Famine.

AN INTRODUCTION TO A STUDY OF THE MONEY QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

Money is known as "the main chance"—significant that, somehow, the hopes of humanity are dependent upon, or at least held in check by, this factor. Faith in the vicarious atonement of Jesus Christ has given way before the march of intellect; and we now, one and all, look to money as our true mediator,—our material medium,—which alone is able to save us from the hells of this life. Every one knows that his material salvation depends upon his success in turning his abilities into money; that, as his money-income is large or small, is he a commander or a slave; that failure to get money means failure to get anything above workhouse fare—if he can get that. Therefore he works hard for money as the only road to a comparative independence,—the only road, in fact, by which his material needs can be satisfied,—and directs the education of his children so that they may be enabled, by proper fitness, through trade, profession, or post of vantage, to secure as much money as possible. This is the proximate and, for most youths, the ultimate end and aim of their education; while the perfecting of themselves as individuals, by the bringing into use of all their faculties, that they may be enabled to appreciate existence in all its many-sidedness and stand on their merits as physiological entities, is left as an object of secondary or remote consideration,—put off, perchance, until the time is too late,—realizable only by those whose lives have been made a bit easy through ancestral endowments, or by those vigorous ones who easily cut their teeth, earn a living, and get a good grip on the earth, despite all obstacles and without all their energies being consumed in the process.

Even the Christian and sympathetically-active people afford evidence of the important part played by money. They know well how difficult it is to propagandize or help the needy without the intermediation of money. So they give money, and pass round the hat for money, to get their religious or charity-distributive machinery in motion, whatever "filthy lucre" sentiments they may give utterance to when they go to church—when they go.

See the eagerness, the unflagging persistence, with which everybody, almost, pursues money! But how strikingly does this eagerness-to-get contrast with their long-standing apathy respecting the essential nature of money! an apathy now, however, giving place to inquiry.

Yet even now, notwithstanding the tacit recognition that money, as a medium of exchange, is a necessity of existence, proposals for allowing the sources of supply of this needful to be free from all legal restrictions are considered absurd and extreme, and meet with scant sympathy. The average educated subject of her Most Gracious Majesty will most likely tell you (when tackled upon this subject), in a tone of conviction that would make a Salvation-Army convert's first sermon pale by comparison, that it is not money, but FOOD, that is wanted to relieve the prevailing distress, and you are expected to perceive, at once, the absurdity of the idea that an interference with the *means* can prevent the *end* being attained. Just as if the taking away of a farmer's ploughs and other tools could possibly affect the yield from his land, or as if an interference with mere exchange could possibly reduce the quantity of things exchanged or affect the equity of exchange! Oh! dear no, quite the other way about. We should all be in a muddle without laws—and so on.

The apathy of the outside public (*i. e.*, outside the circle of financiers who are in the "know") regarding the working of the laws that regulate the money supply—due partly to ignorance of the multiplicity of effects which follow upon any interference with supplies and demands (and we are here concerned, be it borne in mind, with a demand that is boundless for an article or accommodation the supply of which is drastically limited), and partly to the teaching of political economists that a government guarantee of quality is a first essential of a sound money system and quantity an unimportant detail—has led to State regulation of money and banks to an astounding extent, culminating, in England, in such decrees as these:

> And be it enacted that from and after the passing of this act no person other than a banker who on the 6th day of May, 1844, was lawfully issuing his own bank-notes shall make or issue bank-notes in any part of the United Kingdom.
>
> And be it enacted that . . . it shall not be lawful for any banker to draw, accept, make, or issue in England or Wales any bill of exchange or promissory note or engagement for the payment of money payable to bearer on demand, or to borrow, owe, or take up . . . any sums or sum of money on the bills or notes of such banker payable to bearer on demand, save and except that it shall be lawful for any banker who was on the 6th of May, 1844, carrying on the business of a banker . . . and was then lawfully issuing . . . his own bank-notes, under the authority of a license to that effect, to continue to issue such notes to the extent and under the conditions hereinafter mentioned, but not further or otherwise.
>
> And be it enacted that, if any banker in any part of the United Kingdom who, after the passing of this act, shall be entitled to issue bank-notes, shall become bankrupt, or shall cease to carry on the business of a banker, or shall discontinue the issue of bank-notes, either by agreement with the governor and company of the Bank of England or otherwise, it shall not be lawful for such banker at any time thereafter to issue any such notes.—*Bank Charter Act*, 1844; *Clauses* x, xi, xii.
>
> No piece of gold, silver, copper, or bronze, or of any metal or mixed metal of any value whatever, shall be made or issued, except by the mint, as a coin, or a token for money, or as purporting that the holder thereof is entitled to demand any value denoted thereon. Every person who acts in contravention of this section shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty not exceeding £20.
>
> A tender of payment of money, if made in coins which have been issued by the mint in accordance with the provisions of this act, . . . shall be a legal tender,—in the case of gold coins, for a payment of any amount,—in the case of silver coins, for a payment of an amount not exceeding forty shillings, but for no greater amount,—in the case of bronze coins, for a payment of an amount not exceeding one shilling, but for no greater amount. Nothing in this act shall prevent any paper currency which, under this act or otherwise, is a legal tender from being a legal tender.
>
> Every contract, sale, payment, bill, note, instrument and security for money, and every transaction, dealing, matter, and thing whatever relating to money, or involving the payment of or the liability to pay any money, which is made, executed, or entered into, done, or had, shall be made, executed, entered into, done, and had according to the coins which are current and legal tender in pursuance of this act, and not otherwise, unless the same be made, executed, entered into, done, or had according to the currency of some British possession or some foreign State.—*Coinage Act*, 1870; *Clauses* iv, v, vi.

Further: By the bank charter act of 1844 the privileges granted to the Bank of England include a monopoly of issue for so many miles round London, and the right of issuing notes up to £14,000,000 *against paper securities and independently of any gold stock*, the profit upon this latter issue being divided between the Bank and the government. The Bank may extend this kind of issue (notes against securities) to two-thirds of the issues which country bankers may from time to time relinquish, the profit from such extension going all to the government. Any further note issues can be made only against gold and a limited quantity of silver bullion.

Then there are the truck acts, which declare thuswise:

> That in all contracts hereafter to be made for the hiring of any artificer in any of the trades hereinafter enumerated, or for the performance by any artificer of any labor in any of the said trades, the wages of such artificer shall be made payable in the current coin of this realm only, and not otherwise; and that, if, in any such contract, the whole or any part of such wages shall be made payable in any manner other than in the current coin aforesaid, such contract shall be, and is hereby declared, illegal, null, and void.—*Truck Act*, 1831; *Clause* i.

The laws regulating the currency now in operation are but the last of a long series by which the trade of banking has been limited, licensed, taxed, and controlled in its details. The meddling State has at one time limited banking to corporations of not more than six persons, and at another time it has suppressed all notes not worded in terms of payment in gold on demand. It has suppressed all notes of denominations under £5 for England and Wales, refused to allow the benefit of limited liability to bankers in respect of their note issues, and arranged how the accounts of bankers shall be made up. These are evidences of the exercise of the royal prerogative. The issue of money was always assumed to be a kingly function,—a monopoly which could be granted to favorites and others (for a consideration), as when in 1613 King James granted a patent to Lord Harington for the manufacture and issue of farthing tokens, with a proclamation thenceforward prohibiting the currency of all private tokens, either made or to be made, or of any other tokens than those made by his Majesty's authority; or as when in 1697 King William III. gave to the Bank of England the privilege of being the only bank which was to "be created or stablished, permitted, suffered, countenanced, or allowed by act of parliament within this kingdom."

It is apparent that the monopoly of a necessity of existence will keep people poor and in subjection. A true and adequate cause of bad times—a lever which can be used to that end—is at once seen to lie in *money-monopolization*.

Further: the money monopoly, acting through many ages, not only affects money and prevents the course of true exchange from running smoothly, but, by relieving the individual from the necessity of using his judgment upon the merits or demerits of the

various media of exchange that might come before him, prevents him from finding out, by the only sure and experiential way, the most serviceable kinds of money for his particular requirements. Thus, by preventing his mastering the a, b, c of exchange (the condition of free exchange being absent), the monopolists maintain a check upon his complete understanding of the *rôle* that money plays, or can play, in the world's and his own affairs, making the man a confirmed fool upon this most vital factor that affects his interests. Such is State education.

What is called the *social* problem, the *labor* problem, or the *economic* problem of the day being the problem as to what are the essential conditions for securing harmonious relations between individuals in their industrial or producing capacities (differences in the requirements of differently-constituted races being admitted), it is manifestly of prime importance that social, labor, and economic reformers should master the working of the monetary systems in use through which products are exchanged and the industrial relations between men settled. For it is by money and monetary credit that division of labor and specialization of functions yield their gains to people working and trading together on the voluntary plan,—*i. e.*, without compulsory coöperation. Given division of labor as established throughout the productive industries upon which men live, with consequent *indirectness* in all exchanges, and it follows that a defective exchange system will injuriously affect some one, and may injuriously affect the whole social structure. Inequity will result, at the least. If, therefore, the social structure is out of joint, and rewards are divided disproportionately to abilities, and friction between classes results, the machinery of exchange is most reasonably one of the first things to look to, if no other adequate cause of the friction is apparent.

Are our commercial dealings carried out with such an evident fitness to the furtherance of a healthy social state that the demagogue appears like a fish out of water? Unfortunately, it has to be admitted, the relations subsisting between employers and employed are not generally amicable. A state of strain between them has become chronic. Unfortunately, too, the insecurity of tenure that hangs like a sword of Damocles over the employments and living of all who have had the imprudence to be born without the all-important silver or golden spoon in their mouths is exceedingly disquieting,—to them,—and suggests the possibility of inferior individuals and families being perpetuated behind the bulwark of *privilege*.

Now look around and see how the wealth that is produced each year is distributed. You will observe that a great deal of the produce goes to the unemployed rich, without any of their riches going back as a return to the producers, while the unemployed poor get next to nothing. And, when you find that, speaking generally, it is easier to buy with money than to sell for money; that the number of positions in which a decently comfortable living can be made by honest (or dishonest) labor is lamentably small—besides being so often in the gift of the already rich (like church patronage); that moneyed men, by causing the sinews of war to be supplied to governments, through the sheer force of their money to deflect labor into any channel they, the owners of it, please,—getting ploughshares turned into swords and munitions of war produced on any scale to suit the most fastidious governmental taste, and men to march at the beat of the drum to the cannon's mouth at so much a day,—that these money suppliers get for such "service" a hold over the nation's produce for all time (*via* the taxes), while those who give their lives as soldiers to the same governments do so for the bare living and prospect of a beggarly pension to be got that way; when you find, too, that 'cute financiers can and do manipulate all markets for their own enrichment at the expense of *bona fide* traders and producers generally, affecting by their operations—like the parallel operations of military comanders—the employments and lives of millions,—it must be confessed that the money power appears gigantically out of all proportion to what could conceivably arise as the natural, competitive reward for supplying a public want such as a medium of exchange—or for supplying any other want, for that matter. No class of *suppliers* of the other necessaries of life obtain such power; although the privileges granted to patentees, land-owners, and members of the blood-royal approach 'em in kind. And suspicions of fraud—of currency manipulation and legal jobbery—are aroused in the nation's breast. For all this distribution of wealth we are contemplating is supposed to come about under the condition of exchange—and, from what one sometimes hears, there are apparently people who believe it is all the result of *free* exchange,—that free trade exists!

Each person is supposed to give some product of his abilities or some of his possessions in exchange for some of the products and possessions of other persons; and, whether he is a sawyer or a lawyer, a clergyman or a domestic servant, whether the things exchanged are bears or bacon, rum or religion, pleasure or protection, the theory of reciprocal exchange of services is presumed to hold good as to the source of each man's income—if not of each woman's. Even Queen Victoria and her progeny give their extremely valuable services (such as they are) *in exchange* for a few paltry millions—and dirt cheap at the price, too.

Then, if exchange is the order of the world, how does it come about that the exchanges are so very unsatisfying to the many, who yet are unable to adjust them more in accordance with merit? (The question as to what *is* merit can go hang.) The fact that, under apparently free-trade conditions, large incomes are derived directly from trade, in the form of interest and dividends, without any expenditure of labor, while meagre wages *from the same source* are often the only remuneration for great labors, is only explainable upon the hypothesis that the receivers of interest and dividends hold proprietary rights over something which the wage-receivers have not got and cannot do without or get the use of without paying for that privilege.

The manufacture of machinery and plant is not a monopoly (except in so far as patent laws make some of it so) and might be produced to practically any extent, while the land stands on the opposite footing. But the one thing that sets machinery and land and labor in motion is money, and it is the monopoly of this money that affects all production.

As inquirers have been drawn off the scent as to the real cause of the extraordinary power wielded by the gold and silver bugs, by the press and other leaders of the public insisting upon the insignificance of the element of *quantity* in money supplies; and the don't-matter theory regarding the volume of money being much in favor with those who wish to preserve the *status quo*, it will be needful here to demolish it.

This don't-matter theory rests upon the argument that, since gold and silver are commodities, and rise and fall in value in response to variations in the ratio between supply and demand, like commodities in general; and, since, when used as measures of value in the form of money, their rise or fall in value is known as such only by the equal and opposite fall or rise in the value of the other commodities measured and exchanged with them (correct so far); therefore is it assumed and asserted that this very obliging adjustment of volume to value proves that an increase or decrease in the volume of money can have no effect upon its total purchasing power, or, therefore, upon the general welfare. This means that restrictions or expansions of money affect nothing after prices have adjusted themselves to the new volume—if they ever do. Push the argument home to its resting-place, and it will make no difference to any one if the total volume of money be reduced to a three-penny bit, and this locked up in a museum! These people prove money itself to be a superfluity, or they prove nought.

But money is in demand,—a demand that is unthinkable apart from the idea of *quantity*. How is it possible for the monetary requirements of a given quantity of people to be met, except by a quantity of money sufficient to mediate the full quantity of goods and services needing to be exchanged at any given time or by banking credit as extensive as the needs of exchangers? And how can a given quantity of money, however large the amount, meet the wants of a given number of people, however small their number and however meagre their wants, if these people have no access to that money,—if, *e. g.*, that money is stored in the strong-rooms of people who won't part with it except on hard terms? Evidently both volume and availability are fundamentally essential to any monetary system whose *raison d'être* is the facilitation of exchange.

Of course, the same amount of trade can be done with a small as with a large quantity of money, if the availability of the money is equal in both cases and fractional division of it is also equally easy. But that is a great *if*. With everything, the scarcer and dearer it becomes, the easier is it monopolized and kept out of the markets,—if money, kept out of the circulation. Monopolists depend upon scarcity, and try to lessen the production of the article they desire to corner. With money, the less there is of it the more interest will it bring in if lent (an income for nothing at somebody's expense) and the greater the produce will it buy. And *vice versa*, where the measure of value and the medium of exchange are fused together.

Changes in the value of the *monetary unit* will, as is evident, affect men in different ways and degrees, according to their holdings in money and their positions as debtors or creditors at the time. Men being unequally wealthy, changes in the value of wealth will affect them unequally—not *pro rata*. As the measure of value appreciates or depreciates, so is the hold of the creditor over the debtor tightened or loosened, the nominal amount of the original debt remaining at the same figure. Considering the present large indebtedness of the community, the world over, to a creditor class,—through government and individual borrowing,—it is clearly seen that the revenue which labor produces and perennially pays to this class will decrease or increase (*in actual labor cost*, but not necessarily in nominal amount of money) as the monetary unit falls or rises in value. It becomes possible, then, for the class in power to benefit themselves by rigging the money market. The creditor class is in power now, and its self-interest naturally prompts it to keep money on a scarce-metal basis, so that incomes through usury may continue and increase as the metal appreciates. Doubtless, rather than put their dependents to too great a strain and risk losing their monopoly altogether, the gold bugs would prudently yield to the claims of the bimetallists and share the privileges of monopoly with the silver bugs. But bimetallism offers no resting-place as a solution of the money question, for, starting, as this system does, with the admission that the world is suffering from a money famine, the doubt will be raised, in the minds of many who have not thought much upon the subject before, as to the advisability of restricting money at all. If expansion is good, why should not complete freedom prove better?

Should the debtor class get into power and understand its own interests, as the monopolists have understood theirs, the Lord only knows what they'll do. I don't.

Putting aside, as outgrown, the old governmental methods, from Roman times down to the present, of inflation and debasement of the currency—expedients which, however much they may have benefited debtors temporarily, left the original cause of usury untouched, did not ease trade (which asks for extension of good, reliable money, and not of bad), and only prepared the way for reactionary restrictions, leaving the times worse instead of better—there remains the only method that offers really novel features to a stale and fagged-out world: namely, the honest method of a free currency,—*i. e.*, free from State interference. Let us have free trade in the issue of money. Only under freedom can the merits or demerits of any particular monies and instruments of credit have a chance to be demonstrated, and the fittest survive. Good money may be left to drive out bad money unaided. Let it be unhindered.

The free-money men contemplate the establishment of banks of exchange, *for the sole purpose of facilitating exchange* (a social need hitherto much neglected) by means of notes and other credit instruments *issued directly upon the security of values lodged with the banks by their customers*, thus enabling the monetary requirements of said customers and those who trade with them to be met to the extent of such accommodation,—*i. e.*, to the full extent of their exchange requirements,—independently of gold, silver, or other expensive luxuries.

The theory that the farmer, the day-laborer, the clerk, the ballet-girl, the baker, the draper, the builder, and other producers, would be unable to exchange their goods and services one with another, in an easy and honest manner, without the intervention

of gold or silver or custom-house officers, the Free Currency propagandists deem one of the most infantile ideas that ever subjected mankind to acts of parliament, and they assert that *the desideratum* is money, monetary credit that can be produced and offered by combinations of the traders themselves,—by the people requiring that accommodation.

Only through media of exchange backed by a variety of market values—expressed in terms of a unit of value, but not compulsorily convertible into the commodity taken as a unit,—a unit for reference only,—can any section of the community who have no gold or silver trade together independently of the money monopolists, and produce for their own profit, instead of to support a moneyed aristocracy.

No money, no supper. But, money being a necessity of existence only because division of labor makes it so,—it being but a means to facilitate the exchange of property and services for other property a..d services,—it follows that a man's honest command over money will be just equal to the market value of whatever he can offer in the market. When one's purchasing powers are put into operation by relinquishment of agreed equivalent values to the values of the goods or services purchased, a money, to constitute the medium for such buying and selling, needs to be a lien upon actual values,—nothing more, nothing less.

A man's purchasing power is his monetary power, and rightly so. For he cannot purchase what he wants without parting for money (monetizing) his productions or his other property or—through the check system—putting his sales against his purchases at the same time.

In a state of interdependent existence, like the present, when every man's ability to satisfy his wants necessarily includes the ability either to effect exchanges (of what he has for what he is more in want of) or to take *gratis*, success in both methods is inevitably measured in money—by the amount of money one can command. Those who have the money-getting qualities in largest degree are the most successful people in their command over the means of subsistence and all material wealth. They are the fittest for these conditions, whatever the means they have adopted to obtain their success.

JOHN BADCOCK, JR.